

THE
JUDGMENT
OF THE
Church of ENGLAND
In the Case of
LAY-BAPTISM
AND OF
Dissenters Baptism.

L O N D O N:

Sold by A. Baldwin near the Oxford-Arms in
Warwick-Lane. 1712.

Price Six-Pence.

714
714
LAWRENCE

PRINTED

CHALMERS' HISTORY OF
CIVILIZATION



Preface to the Reader.

THE Author of a Book, whose Title is, *The Invalidity of Lay-Baptism*— having found 1st, That no one could validly baptize, but he who is commissioned by Christ to do it; and, 2dly, That no one is commissioned by Christ to do it, but he who is *Episcopally ordain-ed*; and, 3dly, That the Man who baptized him, was not Episcopally ordain'd, but a *Dif-senting Teacher*: This Author, I say, tells us very fairly, that he procured himself to be baptized by an Episcopal Minister. And Dr. *Hicks*, in a long Letter to the Author, prefix'd to this Book, thus compliments his great Performance, P. 12. ‘ It is against the Authority of the pretended Ministers of this [Presbyterian] Mission, who were never duly authorized, and therefore cannot administer truly valid Baptism, that you have written your excellent Book, with great Strength and Perspicuity, as well as Modesty, and confirmed your Doctrine with your Practice. i. e. he had been rebaptized.

As I knew this could not regularly and lawfully be done by any *Parish Priest* of the Church of *England*, without acquainting the *Bishop* of the Diocese therewith, as the *Rubric* commands, it being a new, and (as I take it) an extraordinary Case; so finding it to have been actually done, I concluded with my self, that the

P R E F A C E.

Bishop had been consulted with, and had given way to the solemn rebaptizing an adult Person, who had before been baptized by one of the Presbyterian Ordination, in or with Water, and in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. It did not at all become me, nor was I concern'd, to inquire, which of the Bishops it was, that gave way to, nor who the Presbyter was that perform'd, this new Work : But I set my self in great Earnest to consider what the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *England* was in this Case. Could I have trusted either the Doctor or his *Friend*, I needed to have gone no farther than this little Book ; for there I found they were, both of them, very fully perswaded, that the Church of *England* does absolutely nullify and invalidate all Baptism conferr'd by any one who is not Episcopally ordain'd ; and consequently, requires all such as have not been baptized by Episcopal Hands, to be rebaptized, since Baptism is held necessary by her, where it can be had. But having seriously considered the Offices of *Baptism*, and the *Rubrics*, and compared them with the subsequent Practice of the Episcopal Ministers, I could not find these two Writers had convincingly proved what they intended. And not thinking my self, at present, concern'd in the main Matter disputed, viz. Whether Lay-Baptism be invalid, or whether all the Presbyterian Ministers are meer Lay-men, but only to know what the Opinion of the Church of *England* was in the Matter ; I have, in the following Papers, only taken Notice of what these two Writers alledge, as from the Church of

P R E F A C E.

of *England*, in Favour of their Point : Leaving the rest of the Book to be considered by others, who are at Leisure, and think it worth their while. I wondred indeed, that none of the *Church of England-Clergy*, had taken any Notice of this Book, and the Doctrine endeavoured to be propagated by it, especially the Parish-Priests of *London*; for if this Doctrine be true, I dare engage there is not one of them but has a considerable Number of his Parishioners, who are not *baptized*, nor consequently *Christians*, and yet have lived in constant Communion with him, and have frequently received the Sacra-
ment of *the Lord's Supper*, at his Hands; which thing ought not to have been done, if they are not *Christians*.

He must, at this Rate, look to all the People who are upwards of 50 Years of Age; for 'tis twenty to one, but that they who were *baptized* before the Year 1660, were *baptized* by *Dissenting Teachers*, and are consequently *not baptized* at all. He must also place all such as have left *the Separation* since 1660, and come over to the *Church*, of what Age soever, in the Rank of *Unbaptized*, because 'tis most likely they were *baptized* by *Dissenting Teachers*. Nay he must look to many who were *baptized* by *Church of England Ministers*: For some of them were the Children of *Dissenters*, and *baptized* by *Dissenters*, and tho' they afterwards took Orders of the *Church of England*, yet not having been *validly baptized* themselves, they could not *validly baptize* others; for their being *Ministers* of the *Church of England* did not make them *Christians*;

P R E F A C E.

stians; their *Ordinations* did not give them true *Baptism*, if they had it not before. What Work is here for a *London Minister*! and yet I averr that every Word of it, is, and must be true, if Dissenting Ministers *Baptism* be invalid, according to the Doctrine of Dr. *Hicks*, and his *Friend*: And yet, I profess seriously, that tho' I am acquainted with many of these excellent Persons, and have often been at their Churches, yet did I never hear one of them tell his People, that if they had not been baptized by an Epis-
copal Minister, they must be baptized again, for *they were not Christians*.

For the Sake of these Consequences, I say, I wondred not a little that the Church-Clergy had not taken some Notice of these Doctrines, which are *written, printed, preached, and recommended* in Publick. They will, I assure them, when they grow to any Head, give them more Trouble, than they now seem to be aware of. But it may be they are frightned by what the Doctor says in his *Letter*, P. 17. ‘ In the same Place, Sir, you say you hope that none *vested* *with this Divine Authority*, will fight against it, &c. which if any Clergy-man should do in the Manner you there mention (*i. e.* appearing publickly in Opposition to the Subject of this *Essay, of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism*, P. 120.) I could not but suspect that he was one of those, who took Gifts, and Presents of the *Dissenters*, to let the Names of their Children, who had no other but *Schismatical Lay-Baptisms*, be registered among the true Baptisms of the Church: or at least of another Sort, who to court the Favour

P R E F A C E.

' Favour and Applause of the *Dissenters*, either
' never preach in Defence of the Church against
' *Them*; or if they do, they do it no otherwise
' than barely to shew, that the Church of Eng-
' land is a *safe Communion*, and that those who
' through Mistake separated from it, would be
' in no *Danger of Damnation*, if they returned
' to it. But to shew that Separation from it is
' Schism, and by Consequence a *damning Sin*;
' and that the Separatists of all Sorts from it,
' are, without the extraordinary Mercy of God,
' in great and apparent Danger of *Damnation*;
' these Gentlemen love not to touch upon that
' Point, nor rise to that Height. It was, I sup-
' pose, a Reflection upon these Men, and the
' Indignation he had against their double Prac-
' tices, which provoked a *Divine* [Dr. Birch]
' not very many Years since, to utter a Sarcasm
' upon them, from the Pulpit, in Words to
' this Purpose, *That some* (at the Time he spoke
' it) *were become Fathers of the Church, who ne-*
' *ver were her true Sons.*

I have transcribed this Passage more at large than I needed to have done, on purpose to gratify the Doctor, who was so pleased with it, that I think he went a little out of his way, to fetch it in; and I am afraid he has made the *silly and uncharitable Sarcasm*, his own, by his Allowance of it. I have ventured to put down the Name of that *Divine*, that People may know what Value to set upon that Sarcasm. He was himself born and bred a *Dissenter* (and therefore the Doctor will not know well what to say of his Baptism) and was brought over to the

P R E F A C E.

the Church of *England*, by the Care and good Pains taken with him, by that most excellent Bishop of Oxford, Dr. *Fell*: But he (as the way of weak and warm Heads is) did not know where to stop. I say no more, because the Man is dead; and should hardly have said this, had not the Party, principally aimed at by the Indignation of that poor *Divine*, been Doctor *Tillotson* the Arch-bishop of *Canterbury*, whose Name will live for ever, increasing in Esteem with all good and wise Men, when a Thousand of his pittyful Detractors, shall soon be quite forgotten, or be remembred for a score or two of Years, only for some poor, peevish, and unchristian *Sayings*.

But must it indeed be so that if a Clergy-man of the Church of *England*, should write against *this notable Essay*, he must be one of these two sorts of Clergy-men, whom the Doctor represents in such an odious Manner, that I hope there are not above Twenty such in the whole Kingdom? Cannot a Clergy-man, who sees and dreads the Consequences such a Doctrine will draw after it, endeavour to perswade his Friends that such a Doctrine is not true, and try to prove it false by the best Arguments he can, without being ranked in the Number of such as deserve the *Pillory* and *Deprivation*? P. 18. Cannot an honest Clergy-man defend the *Validity*, tho' not the *Regularity* and *Lawfulness* of Baptism, administered by Dissenting Teachers, without being false to his sacred Trust, if he believe himself warranted so to do, by Scripture, and Authority of the Church-Practice, both Antient and Modern? Must a Clergy-man magnify

P R E F A C E.

magnify his Office, at the Expence of Truth and Charity? Or is he obliged to suffer, patiently and silently, the *unchristianizing* not only so many Hundred Thousands of his own Country-men, Friends, Acquaintance, and near Relations, but all the *Protestants* that are, and have been, for almost two hundred Years, throughout the World, as were not, and only because they were not, so happy as to be baptized by Men Episcopally Ordained? Is he, I say, obliged to suffer this, and hold his Tongue, rather than by his speaking, to diminish the Sacredness of his own *Divine Authority*, and to encourage such as *Separate*, to go on in their own way? I put the worst of the Case, as these People will suppose it may be; and yet no wise and learned Clergy-man, will find himself restrained, from opposing what he accounts a mischievous Errour, and defending what he thinks an useful Truth, for fear of such Consequences as he knows he does not *design*, and knows they are not *Necessary*, nor will follow with People that can consider soberly, and reason justly. But we are fallen, God help us, into Times, when to be a good *Church-man*, means nothing less than *living up to her Doctrine, conforming to her Rules and Orders, communicating constantly with her in Prayers and Sacraments*: But it means, the being loud and contentious in the *Church's Quarrel*; the being exceeding mad against all that are not like minded with us; the talking furiously for her Authority; and the decrying every thing that looks like Moderation and good Temper towards such as differ from us. And therefore whilst

P R E F A C E.

whilst this Ferment lasts, whilst the Nation is under this Inchantment, this strong unnatural Violence, and the Suspension, as it were, of Reason, and calm Deliberation, I will cease to wonder, that some of the Clergy of the Church of *England*, appear not against a Doctrine, that, if it be true, has peopled Hell with many Millions. I will, I say, cease to wonder for a while; because I know not whether Reason, Judgment, Learning, Perspicuity, and all the Qualities that a good Writer ought to have, would signify much, if once the Word were given out, among the *Holy Brother-hood*, that such a Book was written *against* (what they are pleased to call) *the Church*. And, indeed, this Argument is so strong, that I my self am forced to submit to it. As free as I am from any of the aforesaid Restraints, under which the Clergy lie; as little as I have to hope for, or to fear, on secular Accounts; yet do I not dare to own my self, the Writer of this Paper, by setting my Name before it. The Design I have, is as good as the Heart of Man can frame: The Cause I plead for is that of *the Church of England*, of which I ever was, and am, and ever shall be, by the Grace of God, a very faithful and sincere Member; and I am, I think, retained in this good Cause, by Justice and great Charity; and I believe I have maintained it well, and like an honest and a reasonable Man: But yet I own, the Dread of drawing down the Indignation of the Church-Rabble upon me, is so great, that I will not have it so much as whispered, where I live, nor of what Profession I am.

My
Reasons

P R E F A C E.

Reasons and my Arguments have so far favoured the *Dissenters*, that (whatever my Intentions were) they have proved them to be *Christians*, in the Opinion of *the Church of England*; and that I perceive will not go well down, nor be digested well (the more is the pity) by abundance of Smatterers, and young Students in Divinity, who would give more Credit to Doctor *H.* in this Case, recomending a Layman's Treatise, that condemns them all, than to a hundred other Lay-Mens Treatises, endeavouring to make them Christians, tho' they should come into the World, with the Approbation of *the Majority of the Bishops*. And this is another Cause of my Concealment, because I have no Heart to engage with such a wrathful Generation.

And here I put my Pen into the Inkhorn, and fell into a strong and deep Amusement, revolving in my Mind, with great Perplexity, the amazing Change of our Affairs, both Civil and Religious, within the Compass of two Years! And whilst I was going, from the Fulness of my Heart, to utter strange things, I was as it were awakened and relieved, by the Visit of an old Acquaintance, that in his Time, had been considerable in *Doctors-Commons*. To him, after the usual Salutations past, I could not forbear reading (such was our Friendship) this *Preface*, as far as I had gone in it— Upon which, after a little Pause, he replyed, in his grave Manner, to this Purpose; ‘ Your Zeal, I find, has rais'd you a little above your usual Temper: I know not, till you shew me, what Argu-

ments

P R E F A C E.

Elements you have made use of, to prove the
Dissenters to be Christians ; but I can furnish
you with one, if it has escaped your Memory,
from Doctors Commons : And that is, that all the
Prosecutions, Excommunications, Fines and Penali-
ties, that the Dissenters have undergone from
the Days of Old Elizabeth, to the present
Times, are so many Proofs of the Church of
England's owning them to be Christians : For
the Court-Christian has nothing to do with a
ny one but Christians. And it would be a
great Absurdity to excommunicate a Person that
had no Right to Church-Communion ; and he
who is not baptized, has certainly no Right to
Church-Communion.

Here my good Friend ended ; and so will I, when I have desired the Reader to place this, as a fourth Proof of my Position (which I think is a very sensible one, and next to Demonstration) and when I have adjured the Dissenters, as I heartily do, both Teachers and People, by all that is dear and valuable to them, to fulfil my Joy, in coming, and returning, to the Communion of the Church of England ; That I may not only say I have proved them to be Christians, but that they are in this, and all other good Respects, not only almost, but altogether as I am, sincere and constantly-conforming Members of her.

9 NO63

T H E

THE
JUDGMENT
OF THE
Church of ENGLAND
In the Case of
L A Y - B A P T I S M
AND OF
DISSENTERS BAPTISM.

The General Position is,
That the Church of England hath, by no Publick
Act of hers, made or declared Lay-Baptism to be
invalid.

THIS will appear from the first Book I.
of Common-Prayer, which was finish- Proof
ed and confirmed by Act of Parlia-
ment in the 2. and 3. Edward VI. in
1548, and printed in 1549, of which Book the Act
says,— *That it was, by the Aid of the Holy Ghost,*
with uniform Agreement, concluded by the Compilers.
And from the second Book of Common-Prayer
put out in the 5. and 6. Edward VI., in 1552.

In these two Books, in the Office of Private
Baptism, the Rubrics are,— *Let them that be pre-
sent, call upon God for his Grace, and say the Lords-
Prayer, if the Time will suffer. And then ONE of*
them

them shall name the Child, and dip him in the Water, or pour the Water upon him, saying these Words,— N. I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

I. Book.

To the Intent the Priest may examine and try whether the Child be lawfully baptized or no — he is to ask these Questions of those who bring the aforesaid Child to Church.

1. ‘ *By whom was this Child baptized?* ’
2. ‘ *Who was present when the Child was baptized?* ’
3. ‘ *Whether they called upon God for Grace, and Succour, in that Necessity?* ’
4. ‘ *With what thing or matter did they baptize the Child?* ’
5. ‘ *With what Words the Child was baptized?* ’
6. ‘ *Whether they think the Child to be lawfully and perfectly baptized?* ’

These things are in the 1st and 2d Books of *Edward VI.*

Now the Answer to the *first Question*, might well have been in *Edward VI’s Days*— *John Lawrence* the Uncle; or *Jane Lawrence* the Midwife, or *George Hays* a Neighbour and Gentleman. Because in Cases of Necessity, the Baptism of Lay-men was allowed to be used in the Days of Popery; and *Midwives* were expressly ordered to be taught the Form of Baptizing, in Latin. And it does not appear that the *first Reformers* changed this Practice. The first *Rubric* does, without any Strain or Violence, suppose the Child to be baptized by a Lay-Person.

The

The Words are general *Let them that be present—*
 and then—*let one of them—* do so and so—*i. e.*
 baptize it. I will not trouble the Reader with
 Proving this at large, in this place; both *Doctor*
 and *Student* agree, that in this Rubric *Lay-Bap-*
tism was supposed and allow'd, but that it is
 now well mended: instead of *one of them*, it is
 now *the lawful Minister*. See the Doctor's Let-
 ter to the Author of *Lay-Baptism* invalid, pag. 24.
 and the Author, pag. 112.

The second Question is asked for the Satisfac-
 tion of the Minister and the Congregation. For
 Witnesses are not essentially necessary to Bap-
 tism, but the Minister cannot be sure the Child
 was before baptized, unless it be attested by
 Witnesses.

The third Question may be answer'd by say-
 ing Nothing, and the Baptism would not be at
 all affected by it. For though People should
 and ought to call upon God for Grace and Suc-
 cour, in that and all other Cases of Necessity,
 yet if they should omit or forget to do so,
 through Haste, and Fright, and Hurry, the
 Child might, notwithstanding that, be rightly
 baptized. But to call upon God for Grace, is, in
 this place, to say the *Lords-Prayer*; as is also evi-
 dent from the *Catechism* in the Words of the *Cate-*
chist just before that Prayer. And no body will
 affirm that the *Lords-Prayer*, or any other Pray-
 er, is so Essential to Baptism, as to make it *in-*
valid, if omitted.

The fourth and fifth Questions must be posi-
 tively answered—*With Water*; and *in the Name*
of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:

Or

Or else the Child must be unavoidably baptized again. *The Matter and Form* are so essential, that there is no true Baptism without them.

The sixth Question to the People who bring the Child to Church, after it has been thus baptized in Private, is—*Whether they think the Child to be lawfully and perfectly baptized?* To which I suppose the Answer may well be, Yes.

Does it not therefore follow, both from the Question and the Answer, that a Child baptized by a *Lay-Person*, in due *Matter and Form*, is *lawfully and perfectly baptized*? Does it not follow, I say, from Edward VI's Common-Prayer Books, that the *Church of England* then did so believe? I ask, at present, no more: But I think it will also follow clearly from hence, that *lawfully and perfectly*, were Words that did not then refer, to the *Administrator* of Baptism, but to the *Matter and Form*, and *Circumstantial Ceremonies* of it. And, because I may have little Credit and Authority with the Reader, I must tell him, that in the Notes printed by Dr. Nichols, at the End of his Common-Prayer (to whose great Care and Pains I own my self very much obliged, and so I believe would others if they would but read him) and which go under the Name of Dr. Overal, the Remark that is made upon the fourth, fifth, and sixth Questions, is this—*As the fourth and fifth Questions referr to the Substance of Baptism, so the sixth and last referrs to the due Ceremonies and Circumstances that are to be used therein, and to be supplied in the Church, if through haste they were omitted at home.*

And

And if the Author of the *Invalidity of Lay-Baptism*, had better considered these things, he would have seen that this sixth Question was not quite so slight and needless as he makes it. He would have known, it may be, that perfectly was applied to the *Matter* and *Form*; and lawfully applied to the other Particulars required by the Law, in the *Rubrics*. And I think he would not have made the following Conclusion, as he does in Page 112. ‘ And therefore ’tis no wonder that the Church of England, upon a more exact Review of her Liturgy, expunged this Question (*i. e.* the sixth) out of the Rubric, and also for very weighty Reasons took away the Liberty of Lay-Baptizing in her present Liturgy, by requiring even in Cases of Necessity, that Baptism should be administered by the *Minister of the Parish*, or any other lawful Minister that can be procured. Which is a substantial Answer to all Objections that may be raised from her (*i. e.* the Church of England’s) former Practice.

I set down this out of the Book, Page 112, which is also agreed to, as a good Conclusion, by the Dr. in his Letter to him, Page 25.

The Church did certainly leave out the sixth Question, but certainly not for the Reason assigned by these Writers, but probably, because she saw there was no Necessity for it, and not for any Mischief it did. She also left out the third Question, but neither these Writers nor I know *why*; but so it was, and I doubt not but for some good Reason or other. And, whether the Church did truly take away the

Liberty of Lay-Baptizing in her present Liturgy, by requiring even in Cases of Necessity, that Baptism should be administred by *the Minister of the Parish*, or any other *lawful Minister* that can be procured — Whether the Church hath done this or not — I am now come to Consider. The Period of Time assigned for this Change and Reformation of the Rubric, is 1603, the 1st of King James I. in the Conference at Hampton-Court.

But before I come to it, I desire the Reader to remember, that I have been in Possession of my Point, from the Year 1548 to 1603, which is 55 Years. Which take in the Reigns of Edward VI, Queen Mary, and Queen Elizabeth. In all this Time, *the Church of England* (whether Protestant or Popish) did never by any Publick Act of hers, make or declare *Lay-Baptism* to be *invalid*. Now I go on, to see whether she has condemned her former Practice or not.

As for the Account of the Conference held at *Hampton-Court*, between the *Bishops* and some of the *Puritanical Ministers*; before King James I. and all the Privy Council; I must at present be obliged to Mr. *Fuller* for it, in his *Church History*. Cent. xvii. Book ix. Page 8. The Conference began *January 14. 1603.*

' *Private Baptism* (says the King in his Speech) is the third thing, wherein I would be satisfied, in the Common-Prayer. If call'd ' *Private* from the *Place*, I think it agreeable ' to the Use of the Primitive Church; but if ' termed *Private*, that any, besides a *lawful* ' Minister

‘ Minister, may baptize, I utterly dislike it,
[And here (says the Historian) His Majesty
grew somewhat earnest in his Expressions
against the Baptizing by *Women* and *Laicks.*]’

Page 9.

‘ Arch-bishop of Canterbury, Whitgift.

‘ To the Point of *Private-Baptism*, the
‘ Administration thereof by *Women* and *Lay-
Persons*, is not allowed in the Practice of the
‘ Church, but enquired of and censured by
‘ Bishops in their *Visitations*.

King James.

‘ The Words of the Book, (*i. e.* the Com-
‘ mon-Prayer) cannot but intend a Permission
‘ of Women and private Persons to baptize.

Bishop of Worcester, Babington.

‘ The doubtful Words may be
‘ pressed to that Meaning; yet the
‘ Compilers of the Book did not so
‘ intend them, as appeareth by their
‘ contrary Practice. But they pro-
‘ pounded them ambiguously, be-
‘ cause otherwise, perhaps, the Book
‘ would not then have passed the
‘ Parliament.

Bishop of London, Bancroft.

‘ Those Reverend Men intended
‘ not, by ambiguous Terms, to de-
‘ ceive any; but thereby intended
‘ a Permission of *private Persons* to
‘ baptize, in *Case of Necessity*. This
‘ is agreeable to the Practice of the
‘ Antient Church. *Acts 2. when
three Thousand being Baptized in a*

To this he
cited the
Testimony
of the A.
B. of York.

Here he
produced
Letters of
some of
those first
Compilers.

‘ Day, (which for the Apostles alone to do, was
 ‘ at the least improbable) some being nei-
 ‘ ther Priests nor Bishops must be presumed
 ‘ employed therein. And some Fathers are
 ‘ of the same Opinion. [Here he spake much
 and earnestly of the Necessity of Baptism.]

King James.

‘ That in the *Acts* was an *Act extraordinary*,
 ‘ and done before a Church was settled and
 ‘ grounded; wherefore no sound Reasoning
 ‘ thence to a Church established and flourishing.
 ‘ I maintain the Necessity of Baptism, and
 ‘ always thought the Place, John 3, 5, *Except*
 ‘ *one be Born again of Water*, &c. was meant
 ‘ thereof.

‘ It may seem strange to you, my Lords,
 ‘ that I think you in *England* give too much to
 ‘ Baptism, seeing, fourteen Months ago in
 ‘ *Scotland*, I argued with *my Divines* there,
 ‘ for attributing too little unto it: Insomuch
 ‘ that a pert Minister asked me, if I thought
 ‘ Baptism so Necessary, that, if omitted, the
 ‘ Child should be damned? I answered No, but
 ‘ if you call’d to baptize a Child, tho’ privately,
 ‘ refuse to come, I think you shall be damned.

‘ But this Necessity of Baptism I so under-
 ‘ stand, that it is *necessary* to be had, if *lawfully*
 ‘ to be had, that is, ministred by *lawful Ministers*,
 ‘ by whom alone, and no private Person, *in any*
 ‘ *Case*, it may be administred. Though I utterly
 ‘ dislike all *Rebaptization* on those whom *Women*
 ‘ or *Laicks* have baptized.

Bishop

(9)

Bishop of Winton, Bilson.

' To deny private Persons to baptize, in Case of Necessity, were to cross all Antiquity, and the common Practice of the Church ; it being a Rule agreed on, amongst Divines, that *the Minister is not of the Essence of the Sacrament.*

King James.

' Tho he be not of the Essence of the Sacra-
ment, yet is he of the Essence of the right
and lawful Ministry thereof, according to
Christ's Commission to his Disciples — *Go,
Preach and Baptize, &c.*

' The Result was this, to consult, whether
in the Rubric of *private Baptism*, which leaves
it indifferently to *All*, these Words, *Cu-
rate, or lawful Minister may not be insert-
ed.*

This is all that is left us of this Conference, with Relation to the Point in hand ; and according to this Result, the Rubric was mended and the Words *lawful Minister* were inserted. But before I set down these Changes, I desire I may make a few Remarks on what passed in this part of the Conference.

I. From what Arch-bishop Whitgift says, it should seem that Baptism by *Lay-Persons* or *Women*, was not so allowed, as that it should be thought an indifferent thing whether a Child were baptized by a Lay-Person, or a lawful Minister. He says the Bishops in their Visitations *inquired* after such Baptisms, and *ensured* them. I make no doubt but what this Excellent Arch-bishop affirmed, was literally true. The Bishops might censure both the *Baptisms*, and the *Baptizers*, of this sort. But

does the Arch-bishop say, that such Baptisms were *invalid*? Did the Bishops then give Order to have such Children as had been baptized by *Women*, or *Lay-Persons*, baptized again, by a *lawful Minister*?

The good Arch-bishop had a Mind to say, that the Common-Prayer-Book did not so much as permit *Women*, or *Lay-Persons*, to baptize. But the King (and I think with great Reason) was perswaded of the Contrary, and therefore would have it mended.

II. Bishop Babington, who had been the Arch-bishop's Pupil, would not, after what the King had said, affirm that the Book did not intend to permit *Lay-Baptisms*, but that (however ambiguous the Words might be) the practice of the Bishops was, not to permit them; but to inquire after them, and censure them. But still this does not shew that he intended to say such censurable, and censured Baptisms, were *invalid*.

III. Dr. Bancroft the Bishop of London, tho' he saw, by the King's earnest way of speaking, to which side of the Question he inclined; yet very honestly and frankly defended the *first Reformers*; tells the King what they certainly intended, namely to permit *private Persons* to baptize; and the Reason withall why they intended this Permission, namely, because it was the Practice of the Antient Church, &c. And his speaking so much and earnestly of the *Necessity of Baptism*, is a plain Proof of his Judgment in the Matter, and of his Approbation of private Persons Baptizing; because the Practice of the Antient Church was indeed founded on their

Opinion

Opinion of the necessity of Baptism in order to Salvation. This Bishop succeeded Dr. Whirgiff in the See of Cant. (who died about six Weeks after, on Feb. 29. 1603) and was principally concerned in altering the Rubric, and putting in the Words *lawful Minister*. And yet I hope I may reasonably presume ; that, altho' a *lawful Minister* be the proper and only allowed, only required, Administrator of Baptism, yet the Arch-bishop did not so far change his Mind, as to judge all Baptisms not administred by a *lawful Minister*, to be *invalid*. But of this, more by and by.

IV. I must leave it to the Reader to judge how satisfactory the King's Answer is to what the Bishop of London said, and indeed how consistent it is with it self. His Majesty declares that he maintains the *Necessity of Baptism*, and that he always thought the Place of St. John 3. 5. to be meant thereof ; but then he is pleased to say, that he only means it to be *necessary*, where it can be had at the Hands of a *lawful Minister* ; and that no *private Person* may administer Baptism, tho' in a Case of the extreamest Necessity. By which it should seem, that his Majesty put the Necessity of Baptism upon the same foot, with the Necessity of Receiving the other Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*; which few People have ever judg'd so necessary to be received, as to call for it, or take it from an improper, unauthorised, unconsecrated Hand ; no not even those who believed that Infants (upon the Peril of their Souls) were to receive the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*. The Necessity of

Baptism maintained by the King, is so little urgent, that he thinks the Infant may as well die *unbaptized*, as baptized by an *unlawful Hand*. My Undertaking does not oblige me to dispute against the King's Opinion (which is contrary to that of the antient Church) but to shew what I think it was. But mark the Inconsistency of it. He is utterly against *Re-baptizing* such as had been before baptized by *Laicks*. But is not this to allow their Baptism to be valid? And is it as well for a Child to die *unbaptized*, as baptized by a *Laick*, whose Baptism must not be reiterated? If Lay-Baptism be invalid, how can it possibly consist with the Belief of the Necessity of Baptism, to deny the Re-baptizing Infants so baptized? Men may make Premises if they will, but Consequences make themselves. If Baptism be absolutely necessary from a *lawful hand*, and a *Lay hand* be not a lawful Hand, then *Lay-Baptism* is not the Baptism that is absolutely necessary: It must therefore be had from a Hand that is *lawful*. If therefore the King will not, by any means, allow of *Rebaptizing* such as were baptized by *Lay-hands*, other Folks will infer, for him, either that such Baptism is *valid*, or that Baptism is not absolutely necessary. Thus far, however, the King is clear in, that such as were baptized by *Laicks*, must not be *re-baptized*: And therefore the *Rubric* (as far as the King is concern'd in it) that makes the Administrator of Baptism to be a *lawful Minister* only, does not necessarily inferr the *Re-baptizing* of such as were not baptized by a *lawful Minister*. I shall only add, in this place, that

that the *Ministers* whom King James mentions, and whom he calls *his Divines*, were *Presbyterians*, and of *Presbyterian Ordination*: And therefore their Baptism was, according to the modern *Dialect*, but *Lay-Baptism*. But K. James did neither think so, nor say so.

V. Bishop *Bilson* is intirely of the same Opinion with Bishop *Bancroft*, and says it is a Rule agreed on amongst Divines, that the *Minister* is not of the *Essence of the Sacrament*. i. e. that if Baptism be conferr'd in the *Matter* and *Form* prescribed by Christ, it is effectual to all the Purposes of Baptism, let what Christian soever conferr, or administer it.

To this the King replies, that tho' the Minister be not of the *Essence of the Sacrament*, yet he is of the *Essence of the right and lawful Ministry thereof*, according to Christ's Commission — *Go preach and baptize*, &c. i. e. if I rightly understand it, that the *Sacrament of Baptism* cannot be rightly and lawfully administered, without a *Minister* commissioned by Christ to do it. Which is what his Majesty had said before, in Substance, to the *Bishop of London*.

No one can possibly imagine, that these two learned Bishops did not very well know, that those whom Christ commissions and sends to baptize, are the only Right and Lawful Administrators of Baptism; and that when such can be had, none else should undertake to baptize. But the Question now in hand was, whether Baptism was not so necessarily to be had, that, rather than the Child should dye without it, it might be administered by One who

who was not commissioned to do it, nor consequently had Authority given him to do it: And whether, when it was once administered and conferred by this unauthorized Hand, it was so valid as not to be repeated or reiterated again? this was the Question. The King was for having the Child baptized by none but by a lawful Commissioner: But in Case it had been baptized already by an uncommissioned Hand, he utterly disliked the Re-baptizing such a Child. The Bishops (with the best Antiquity) maintained, that the Necessity of the Case made the Administrator of Baptism (tho' in all respects besides an unlawful Hand) a lawful Minister, in this Performance; and were not for Re-baptizing any one who had been seriously baptized by any Christian with Water, and in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And thus the Matter stood between them.

These Remarks I thought might be for the Reader's Service, before he comes to consider the Changes made in the *Rubric*. And tho' he may easily perceive, that I am with the Bishops, against the King, in this Matter; yet I could not but think it fair, to let him see, that the *Rubric* was amended and changed according to the King's Pleasure; and that instead of that general, indetermined Expression of *One of them*, the Words *lawful Minister* were inserted, as they now stand.

After this manner then the *Rubric* was changed in 1604.

First, let *the lawful Minister* and them ¹⁶⁰⁴ that be present, call upon God for his Grace, and say the Lords-Prayer, if the Time will suffer: And then the Child being named by some one that is present, the said *lawful Minister* shall dip it in Water, or pour Water upon it, saying these Words, *N. I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

[In the Review of the Common-Prayer ¹⁶⁶¹, this *Rubric* was thus changed, and now stands—, ‘First let *the Minister of the Parish*, or in his Absence, any other *lawful Minister* that can be procured, with them that are present call upon God and say the Lords-Prayer, and so many of the Collects appointed to be said before in the *Form of Publick Baptism*, as the Time and present Exigence will suffer. And then the Child being named by some one that is present, the Minister shall pour Water upon it, saying these Words, *N. I baptize thee, &c.]*

‘And let them not doubt but that the ¹⁶⁰ Child so baptized, is lawfully and sufficiently baptized, and ought not to be baptized again. But yet nevertheless, if the Child which is after this fort baptized, do afterward live, it is expedient that it be brought into the Church, to the Intent that if the Priest or Minister of the same Parish did himself baptize that Child, the Congregation may be certified of the true Form of Baptism, by him privately before used

1661. [The Rubric is the same with the foregoing one, only the Words *But* and *Priest* are left out ; and after the Words *before used* is added, — ‘ In which Case he shall say thus, — I ‘ certify you, that according to the due and pre- ‘ scribed Order of the Church, at such a time, ‘ and at such a place, before divers Witnesses, I ‘ baptized this Child]

1604
and
1661. ‘ Or if this Child were baptized by ano- ‘ ther lawful Minister, that then the Minister ‘ of the Parish, where the Child was born or ‘ Christned, shall examine and try, whether the ‘ Child be lawfully baptized or no.

‘ In which Case, if those who bring any ‘ Child to the Church do answer that the same ‘ Child is already baptized; then shall the Mi- ‘ nister examine them farther, saying,

1. ‘ By whom was this Child baptized ?

2. ‘ Who was present when this Child was ‘ baptized ?

‘ Because some things *essential* to this Sacra- ‘ ment may happen to be omitted through Fear, ‘ or Haste, in such Times of Extremity; there- ‘ fore I demand farther of you,

3. ‘ With what *Matter* was this Child bap- ‘ tized ?

4. ‘ With what *Words* was this Child bap- ‘ tized ?

The first thing I would observe, to the Reader, upon these Changes of the *Rubric*, is, that they were made by the King’s sole Authority and Command. They had neither *Act of Par- liament*, nor *Act of Convocation*, to countenance them. This was a Stretch of Power, but be- cause

cause it troubled no Body, it was easily submitted to. However, tho' the Alterations were very reasonable and good, yet they were not *Legal*, till made so by the Legislative Power in 1661.

But, *Secondly*, taking them, as they now are, to be both good and obligatory, the Question is, Whether the Church of *England* does hereby declare, that *Lay-Baptism* is invalid? To which I reply,

1. The Church of *England* does certainly call for, and require a *lawful Minister* to be the Administrator of Baptism.

2. The Church of *England* does certainly (at least since 1661 or 1662) by a *lawful Minister*, mean and intend a Minister *Episcopally ordained*.

3. The Church of *England* neither allows, nor permits, any other than such as are *Episcopally ordained*, to administer Baptism.

4. The Church of *England* does hereby (implicitly at least) forbid any other than those of *Episcopal Ordination*, to baptize.

5. The Church of *England* inquires after, censures, and punishes (where she can) such as administer Baptism, if they are not qualified lawfully to do it.

But after all, I must own, that I do not think the Church of *England* does, by any, or all these *Rubrics*, intend to make or declare *Lay-Baptism* to be *invalid*. She calls for none but lawful Ministers; 'tis true; all Churches in the World do the same thing; it is not to be expected they should do otherwise. She does, by her

her Rubrics, *allow* or *permit* no other ; that is also certain ; Can any Church, by a *Rule*, allow a thing she thinks *irregular*? Even the Rubrie of K. Edward's Book, was so worded, as to leave it disputable and doubtful whether the Church allowed or intended to allow of *Lay-Baptism*, in Cases of Necessity ; insomuch that Archbishop Whitgift and Bishop Babington contended that it did not *permit* such *Lay-Baptism*. And much less can it be expected that a *Rubric*, that was changed on Purpose to remove such Doubt, should *permit* or *allow* of *Lay-Baptism*. But none of these things do either in themselves *nullify* and *invalidate* *Lay-Baptism*, or signify that the Church does look upon it as *invalid*, when once it is administered or conferred by a *Lay-Hand*. For if it did, it would certainly and expressly order such Children to be *rebaptized*. Why should it not, since it maintains the Necessity of Baptism, where it can be had ? The Church of Rome, in all the *Rubrics* of its *Form of Baptism*, supposes the Administrator of that Sacrament to be always a proper and an authorized Person : It says in every Place, that the *Priest* is to do so and so, and the *Priest* is to say thus and thus ; and in none of its publick *Forms* does it allow or permit *any other* to officiate : And yet we know the Doctrine of that Church allows and approves of *Lay-Baptism*. We know that, in Fact, when a *Priest* is not present, that it allows a *Deacon* to baptize ; when a *Deacon* is not to be had, it allows a *Subdeacon* (which is as much in holy Orders as a Waterman upon the

Thames)

Thames) to baptize ; when a Subdeacon is not present, it allows a Lay-Man to baptize ; when a Lay-Man is not there, it allows a Woman to do it ; nay, if the Lay-Man be utterly ignorant of the *Form*, or *Words*, it allows the *Midwife* before him, to baptize the Child. This we know is the Doctrine, this we know is the Practice of the Church of *Rome* ; and yet in all the Rubrics of its *Office of Baptism*, it only mentions the *Priest*, the *Sacerdos* ; and it tells us, in none of them, that it permits or allows of *any other* but a *Sacerdos*. Who can expect it should ? it is not a proper Place for it. And therefore I do not by any Means think it a conclusive way of arguing, to say the Church of *England* has, by its Rubrics, invalidated *Lay-Baptism*, because, by its Rubrics, it requires only a *lawful Minister* to baptize, and forbids all others to baptize, and blames, and condemns, and punishes such as baptize, who are not lawfully qualified to do so. This only signifies that she would not have it done ; but it does not signify, that it is not *effectually* done, when it is *actually* done. For if it did, she must order it to be done again, if she judg'd it absolutely necessary to be done at all. I do not pretend to enter into the Merits of the Cause, nor to dispute whether Lay-Baptism be valid, or invalid ; nor whether it be lawful or unlawful to rebaptize such as have been baptized by Lay-Hands. This is not at present my Undertaking : But my Aim is to shew, that the Church of *England* has not, by these *Rubrics*, declared Lay-Baptism to be invalid ; or, (in other Words) that a lawful Minister,

nister, is so essential to the Validity of Baptism, that Baptism administered by a Lay-Hand is null and void. Nay, I am going about to try to shew the Reader, that the Church of *England* hath, in these very *Rubrics*, declared her Judgment to be, That (in the Words of Bishop *Bilson*) *the Minister is not of the Essence of the Sacrament.*

The Way I take to do it is this.

When the Child that was privately baptized, is brought to the Church, in order to have the rest of the Ceremonies and Service performed and compleated, altho' it were baptized before, by a *lawful Minister*, yet is the Minister of the Parish, for his own Satisfaction and that of the Congregation, to ask these following Questions :

1. *By whom* was this Child baptized?
2. *Who was present* when this Child was baptized?

The Minister of the Parish is to know who was the *Administrator*, and who were *Witnesses* to the Baptism administered: He could not otherwise be assured the Child had been baptized. Now because these Questions are asked, in this place, as well as the two following ones, concerning the *Matter* and *Form*, it is concluded by some, that the Church of *England* looks upon the *lawful Minister* to be as *essential* to Baptism, as the *Water* and the *Words*. But if she does, how comes she to place so notable and distinguishing a Clause, betwixt the two first and the two last Questions, as this is ; —

‘ Because some things *essential* to this Sacra-

ment

ment may happen to be omitted through Fear, or Haste, in such Times of Extremity, therefore I demand farther of you,

‘ 3. With what *Matter* was this Child baptised?

‘ 4. With what *Words* was this Child baptised?

Can any one read this Clause, thus inserted in the Middle of (and as if it were to part) these Questions, and believe the Church of *Eng-*
and thought the *Administrator* and the *Witnesses* as *essential* as the *Matter* and the *Words*, to
the conferring Baptism? Had the Church believed a lawful Minister to be as *essential* to the
making a Baptism *valid*, as she did the *Matter*
and the *Words*—she must and she would have
aid thus—‘ Because some things *essential* to
this Sacrament may have been neglected or
omitted, through Haste, or Fear, I must ask
you—By *whom* was this Child Baptized, with
what Matter, and *what Words* was it Baptized
&c. i.e. was it baptized by a *lawful Minister*,
and with the *Matter* and *Words* prescribed by
Christ? But, to ask first—*by whom*? And
secondly—*before whom*? And then to suspect
some thing *essential* to Baptism might have
been omitted, and to mention those *Essentials*
in the third and fourth Questions, is, in my
Opinion, to intimate that the two first Questions
did not contain things *Essential* to Baptism.
And that it may appear what Reason I have to
think so, I desire the Reader to consider the
following Rubric, which is the last in the Office
of *private Baptism*—

‘ But if they which bring the Infant to the Church, do make such uncertain Answers, to the Priest’s Questions, as that it cannot appear that the Child was baptized with Water, *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,* (which are essential Parts of Baptism) then let the Priest baptize it, in the Form before appointed for publick Baptism of Infants, saving that at the dipping the Child in the Font, he shall use this Form of Words— *If thou art not already baptized, N. I baptize thee, &c.*

Why does not the Church say here, if it cannot appear that the Child was baptized by a lawful Minister, let it be conditionally baptized? Why does not the Church here tell us (and could there be a fitter place to tell us?) that a lawful Minister is essential to a valid Baptism? When it is reckoning up the essential Parts of Baptism, could it forget the Minister, if that were also an essential Part? I am perswaded neither could, nor would. And I therefore think I have proved, that, in the Judgment of the Church of England (what the Bishop of Winchester affirmed was a Rule agreed amongst Divines) *The Minister is not of the Essence of the Sacrament of Baptism.*

And thus I have gone through all the Offices of Baptism, and the Rubrics that relate to the Matter; and having considered them with a due Care and Impartiality I could, I do not find that the Church of England hath, in any of them, declared Lay-Baptism to be invalid; and yet they are the Plates, and the publick Addresses where one would look for and expect such a Declaration, the most properly. The

The *second Proof* of the general Proposition, is fetched from the Silence of the Church of *England* in this Particular. She hath in no publick Act of hers, ordered such as have been baptized by Lay-Hands to be *re-baptized* by a lawful Minister. I have already had Occasion to make this Observation in another place before. But it is, indeed, a clear and distinct Proof of the Judgment of the Church in this Matter. Had she been of the Mind, that Lay-Baptism was null, invalid, and ineffectual, her Care and Tenderness for all the People of this Kingdom, would have obliged her to command the Re-baptizing by lawful Ministers, all such as had not had a valid Baptism, if they could be brought to it. But she has no where intimated, no where suggested, much less expressed, or plainly signified, any such Purpose, or Design to have it done.

It be said, that from 1604 to 1661, the Church had either no *Occasion*, or *Opportunity*, of declaring her Judgment in this Point; yet the World will acknowledge she had *both*, in great degree, at the Time of the *Restoration* of King *Charles II.* when she might very reasonably suppose there were, in *England* and *Wales*, no other than two or three hundred thousand souls, baptized by such hands as are now called *Lay-Hands*, and were then esteemed and held *lawful* and un-authorized Hands. May we not fairly enough compute, that Six Parts in Ten, of all the People of the Kingdom, who were fourteen or fifteen Years Old, when King *Charles II* returned to his Throne, had been

baptized by such as the Church will not acknowledge for *lawful Ministers*? And what was there done with all this Number? What Care was taken by the Church to secure their Christianity? If the Church accounted them already to be validly baptized, the Question is given up. If she accounted their Baptism to be invalid, what Provision was there made, to have them *re-baptized*? I answer, none at all. And I say so with the greater Assurance, because I see that Dr. *Hicks*, tho' very able, and keenly edged to this purpose, hath not been so lucky as to produce one good Reason to make us believe that the Office of *Ministration of Baptism* to such as are of riper Years, was intended for such as had been *invalidly baptized* by *unlawful Ministers*; altho he thinks he has Reason to say it was. He does not, I own, affirm it, in an peremptory, magisterial Manner: But because he says it at all, and because his Authority (even in Matters of Conjecture) is much greater with those for whose sake I take these Pains, than could wish it were, in Matters where I think he is much mistaken; because of this, I say it lies upon me, to consider what he has said upon this Point.

Thus then the Doctor speaks in his Letter to the Author of the *Invalidity of Lay-Baptism*, p. 21

' You have well observed, That our Church
 ' hath provided no Office of Confirmation for those
 ' who receive Baptism from *Lay-Baptizers*. And
 ' indeed it would have been strange, that she
 ' which allows of no Baptism but by a *lawful Minister*, should have provided such an Office.'

to confirm or ratify the Baptism of those, who (truly speaking) were *sprinkled* or *washed*, but not *baptized*. But I think you might, with Reason enough, have farther observed, that *she hath* provided an Office for their true and lawful Baptism. I mean, Sir, *The Ministrati-*
on of Baptism to such as are of riper Years. This new Office was made presently after the *Restoration*, and is part of the *Liturgy* that now is confirmed by *Act of Parliament*: And I do not think it was intended only for *Heathens*, *Jews*, and *Mahometans*, who should be converted to Christianity, or for such converted Hereticks among us as reject Baptism; but also for those who had been *invalidly baptiz-*
ed; of which there were great Numbers at the Time of the Restoration, and now alas, are many more. I submit this Observati-
on to your Thoughts, and the Considerati-
on of all who shall read it: And if my
Opinion, as to this Office, is wrong, I hope
my Error is pardonable, because it is not
hurtful to the Church, nor casts the least
Dishonour upon her learned and pious Bish-
ops and Priests her Representatives, who
made that Office, which before was wanting.

The Remarks I would make upon this Pa-
ge, are these.

1. I desire the Doctor and his *Friend*, to make little Inquiry into the Matter of Fact, and to examine, whether the Bishops after the *Restau-*
ration in 1660, did not go about their several *Dioceses*, and *confirm* many Thousands of such
as had been baptized by unlawful Ministers, and

not by the Form in the *Common-Prayer*? and whether they made, or tried to make, any Distinction between such young People, as had been baptized by *Orthodox* Ministers, and such as had been baptized by Men who were not *Episcopally ordained*? Did they declare or intimate that such as had been baptized by the *latter*, were not baptized *lawfully*, and therefore could not be *confirmed*? Did they reject any one on this account? Or did they use any other Office of Confirmation, than the present one, to confirm all that were brought to them? I verily think that, upon Enquiry, it will be found, that not a single Bishop in the Kingdom, did then refuse to confirm any one, upon Pretence of their not being *lawfully baptized*, by a *lawful Minister*. Let the Doctor and his *Friend*, then, consider whether this Practice of the Bishops at that Time, be not an implicit Declaration of their Judgment, *First* That there was no need of a new Office of Confirmation, for such as had been baptized by Lay-Baptizers; and *Secondly*, That such as they confirmed were held by them to have been validly baptized. If a Bishop shall *confirm* a Thousand People, who (he knows, or might know) had been baptized by one that was not *Episcopally ordained*, with the same *Words and Ceremonies*, with which he confirms another Thousand People who had been baptized by an *Episcopal Minister*; will not every one conclude, that this Bishop thinks the Baptism of both these Thousands to be equally and alike *valid*, tho' neither *regularly*, nor *orderly*, nor *lawfully* at first conferred? Now whether

this was not the Practice of the Bishops at that Time, I leave to the Doctor and his Followers to inquire, remember, and consider.

2. I agree with the Doctor that it would have been a strange thing for the *Convocation* (had they been of his Mind) to have made a new Office of Confirmation for such as had been baptized by *Lay-Baptizers*. It had certainly been very absurd to *confirm* such People, as they thought had never been *validly* baptized. But is not the Conclusion as good on the other hand, that such as were *confirmed* by the old *Office* must needs be thought to be *validly* baptized, by such as confirmed them? *A. B.* was baptized in 1650, by a Minister of the *Presbyterian Ordination*; and *A. B.* was *confirmed* in 1662, by a Bishop of the Church of *England*, according to the *Office* appointed for that Purpose. Will not most People conclude, from hence, that the Bishop held the Baptism of *A. B.* to be *valid*? This I think is as plain, as if it were deduced from *Definitions*, *Axioms*, and *Propositions*, &c.

3. As to what the Doctor says, That he thinks the Church hath provided an Office for the true and lawful Baptism of such as had been invalidly baptized, it is very much to the Purpose, if he can make it good. It would utterly subvert the Objection that is in every body's Mouth, *viz.* That had the Church held the Baptism of *unlawful Ministers* (*i. e.* such as were not ordained by Episcopal Hands, and are consequently held as mere *Laicks*) to be null and *invalid*, she must and would have ordered all such People to be *rebaptized* by lawful Ministers. To

this the Doctor says, that the Church hath adjudged all such Baptisms to be *invalid*, and that such People were only *sprinkled* or *washed*, and not *baptized*, and hath provided a *new Office* for the true and lawful Baptism of them, namely,---the *Ministratⁿion of Baptism for such as are of riper Years*. This Office he says was intended for such as had been *invalidly baptiz^d*, as well as for *Heathens, Jews, Turks and Hereticks*. When I first read this Passage, I could not forbear repeating to my self, *How hard a Saying is this?* And it was not without Concern, that I remembred it came from a Man, now venerable for his Years, as well as for his Virtue, and his Learning. But with what Reason does he support this his Assertion, or Conjecture? Those he brings in this Place (as the Reader may see) are, that *this Office* was made *new* after the *Re-storation*; and that, at *that Time*, there were many People who had been *invalidly baptiz^d*. This Office was indeed *new*; but is it not rather to be wondred at, that there was not, long before this Time, a Form of Baptism for *adult Persons*, in a Church so well establish'd as ours was? My Guess is, that in the Days of *Edward VI. Q. Mary, Q. Elizabeth, and K. James*, and the greatest part of *K. Charles I.* there were very few People in *England*, that express'd any *Dislike of Infant-Baptism*; the Doctrine and the Custom was all in its Favour, and therefore there was no very visible need of a *Form* for baptizing People of *riper Years*. But in the Times of *Civil War, and Anarchy*, these wicked Tares grew up in great Plenty; and this part of *Anabaptism*

tism, as well as the other of *Rebaptizing*, prevailed very much ; so that betwixt the Years 1640 and 1660, there were a great many young People that had never been baptized at all ; even now to justify the Wisdom of the Church in composing a *new Form*, that might serve for them, as well as all others whom the Doctor reckons up. This is but my Conjecture ; but I dare say, the impartial Reader will incline to think, that the *Convocation*, which composed this *new Office*, had full as much Regard to *these* People, as to the *invalidly baptized*. The great Number of *these last*, is the *other Reason* which induces him to think that this new Office was intended for them. But, in my Opinion, this is taking the thing in Question, for granted. He supposes the Church to account all such as had been baptized by *unlawful Ministers*, to have been *invalidly baptized* ; But has the Church made any such Declaration ? I have been trying to prove (and I hope I have proved) that she has not. The Fundamental Mistake, I think, is this, that because the Church requires a *lawful Minister* to be the Administrator of Baptism, in her *Rubrics* ; therefore she accounts all Baptisms not conferr'd by a lawful Minister, to be null and *invalid*. This is by no means a necessary Consequence : She has no where said so ; and her Practice is clearly otherwise, as I have shewn, by the Bishops Confirmations in 1661 and since, and by her ordering none of them to be rebaptized. Which I still insist on, to be a good Proof, and which is not at all weakened by these two Reasons of the Doctor, of which

I leave

I leave the Reader to judge. But it may be he is better provided, two or three Pages off; for there he resumes the same Argument, whether out of Confidence or Distrust of what was said before, I will not determine; but thus he says, p. 24.

‘ Sir, From these Observations [viz. that no new Office of Confirmation was provided for such as were baptized by Laicks ; that the Office of Baptism for such as were of riper Years, was intended for such as had been invalidly baptized ; that Baptism was absolutely necessary to Salvation, was an erroneous, tho’ innocent and pious, Opinion ; and that such happy Alterations had been made in the Liturgy] ‘ From these Observations, Sir, I think I may conclude, *First*, That the *absolute indispensable Necessity of Baptism* is not the Doctrine of the Church of *England*. *Secondly*, That she approves of no Baptism, or thinks no Baptism duly and validly administered, but what is ministred by duly authorized and lawful Ministers, and consequently that she rejects all *Lay-Baptism*. *Thirdly*, That she cannot count those duly authorized and lawful Ministers, who take upon them the Ministry, within the Pale of her Jurisdiction, in Contempt of, and Opposition to, her Episcopat, and Episcopal Mission, or Power of Ordination ; and by Consequence, that she must look upon Baptism administered by such Ministers, as null and void, from the Beginning.

‘ From these Conclusions, and the Consequences issuing from them, I have farther Reason to think, that the Office of the Minister,

‘ on

' on of Baptism to such as are of riper Years was
 ' intended for Persons *invalidly baptized* by such
 ' *unlawful Ministers* among us, as were never
 ' duly authorized, as well as for converted
 ' *Heathens*, *Jews*, *Mahometans*, and such mo-
 ' dern *Manicheans*, and *Seleucians* among us, as
 ' held it unlawful to baptize with the Baptism
 ' of the Church.

As I take this Passage to be but a Repetition of what he had said before, a little enlarged ; so I acquaint my Reader, that I shall be constrained to repeat, in my Reply, a great deal of what I have before said.

1. Whether it be an erroneous Opinion, That Baptism is absolutely necessary to Salvation, is not proved by him, but affirm'd. Whether the indispensable Necessity of Baptism be the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, or be not, I am not able to determine, I acknowledge, with full Certainty. He who says that such an Opinion is erroneous, will say, among us, that it is not the Opinion of the Church of *England*: And I, who incline to think it is the Opinion of the Church of *England*, do so far think it not to be erroneous. And because I am perswaded that she does not hold *Lay-Baptism* to be *invalid*, I am also so far perswaded that she holds Baptism to be indispensably necessary, where it can possibly be had: She will have *Lay-Baptism*, in the want of a lawful Minister, rather than none at all.

2. I must repeat again, that it does not necessarily follow, that the Church *rejects* all *Lay-Baptism*, or accounts all Baptism conferred by Men not Episcopally ordained, to be *null* and *invalid*,

valid, because she does in all her Offices and Rubrics call for and require a lawful Minister to conferr Baptism. This, the Doctor knows, is not a certain Consequence in the Church of *Rome*, which in her Office of Baptism requires a *Priest*, a *Sacerdos* only, to administer that Sacrament. And I would ask him, if he thinks that the Church of *England*, when she changed her *Rubric* in 1603, from those indefinite Words — *Let one of them* — *into* — *a Lawful Minister*, whether she did thereby intend to *invalidate* and utterly *annull* all Baptisms that had been before conferr'd by *Lay-Hands*? or whether she baptized again, by a lawful Minister, such *Lay-baptized*? What if I should acquaint the Doctor, that in all the *Offices of Baptism*, whether *Publick* or *Private*, that of *Infants*, or that of *adult* and grown-up Persons, there is not so much as the Word *Deacon* to be found in them throughout? and that both *Minister* and *Curate*, which are used in them, do signify a *Priest*, and nothing but a *Priest*. This I assure him, is Matter of Fact, and exactly true, as he will find upon Examination. Will he give me Leave to conclude from hence, that a *Deacon* may not baptize a Child, because he is not mentioned or required in any of these *Offices*, or their *Rubrics*? He will, it may be, say, that a *Deacon*, when he is ordained, has it in his Commission, *to baptize Infants in the Absence of the Priest*. I know he has; but let him go to that *Office*, and see if the Administrator of Baptism is not always to be a *Priest*, or *Minister*, or *Curate*, which, I say is but one and the same Man,

Man, viz. a *Priest*: And let him reconcile the *Rubric* which calls for a *Priest*, with his *Commission* of a *Deacon*, which allows him to baptize in the *Priest's Absence*. I would not be thought to make this a parallel Case, it is not exactly so; but I would make this Use of it, that to insist too rigidly upon the *Letter* of the *Rubric*, when the *customary Practice* of the Church allows of Relaxations and Abatements, is to be over-wise, or over-scrupulous. The Church, in all her Rules, and Orders, must call for and require, what she thinks best, and would most gladly have; but whilst she is made up of frail, imperfect Creatures, and subject to numberless Accidents, she must be content with the best Performances she can obtain. And, if she can secure the *Essentials* of Religion, will bear with the Want of many convenient and expedient *Circumstantials*, till it pleases God to make her easy with them also. The Church, in her *Rubric*, calls for a *lawful Minister* to baptize the Child; and calls for no body else; and would gladly have no body else; but, in the Interim, another Person comes, call'd only by Necessity, or call'd perhaps through Fondness of the Parent, or through mistaken Judgment, but is by no means the Person call'd for and intended by the Church: However, he performs the Office, and baptizes the Child, in the same Element of Water, and with the same Words of Christ, who was the blessed Institutor of this Sacrament. The Church is offended at this Proceeding; censures, blames, condemns, and punishes, the Intruder and Usurper on the

Holy

Holy Office (unless it were in a Case of pure Necessity.) But after all, she sees the Sacra-
ment *essentially* administred, the *Matter* and the *Words* of Christ were seriously used, and tho'
the Voice and Hand that administred, were
both unhallowed, yet will she not *invalidate*, or
disanull this Work. The Doctor very well knows
this was the way of reasoning in the Antient
Church; and (because I have proved it) I am
bold to say it is the way of reasoning in the
present Church of *England*. And as she never
has, so I believe she never will depart from that
good Standard, in this Particular. The Laws,
with very good Reason, have appropriated the
Coinage of all the Money current in the King-
dom, to the *Prince*; and they have made it high-
ly criminal for any Man else but such as are
substituted and appointed by proper Officers,
under the Regulation of the Crown, to have
any Hand in the work of Coining: And the
numberless Mischiefs that would ensue upon
permitting every private Man to coin, if he
could, do very well justify the restraining it to
such and such elected and appointed Persons,
and punishing, even with Death, all that trans-
gress this Law, altho' the Pieces they coin
should be of equal Weight and Fineness, with the
Standard, and tho' the Image, Arms, and Super-
scription, should be as right and good, and to
all appearance the same with those that were
coined in the *Tower-Mint*, by the Queen's pro-
per Officers. But yet these Pieces would be
current still, the Prince would not *recoin* them,
nor would the People *refuse* them; because of
their

their intrinsic Worth, and their external Form. The Hand that made them might be deservedly cut off, but the Piece is *essentially* good ; the Weight and Fineness, Head and Arms demonstrate it to be so.

3. Altho' the Church should not count the *Dissenting Ministers*, to be duly authorized and *lawful Ministers*, yet she need not, of Consequence, look upon Baptism administered by them, as *null* and *void* from the Beginning. This is begging the thing in Question, and not proving it. The Church may (tho' I do not take upon me to say she *does*, but supposing she *may*) count all the other Parts of the Ministraton that are performed by Dissenting Ministers, to be *null* and *void*; yet it would not necessarily follow, that she should therefore count their *Baptisms* to be *null* and *void*. This is the single thing contended for. Abundance of People, I doubt, are easily led to think their *Baptisms* to be *invalid*, because they think if their *Baptisms* be allowed, the rest of their Ministerial Performances must be also valid. But this was held to be no Consequence by the Antient Church of Christ; nor is it a Consequence held by the Church of *England*. 'Tis *Baptism alone* that is not invalidated and made *null*, tho' conferred by an unlawful Minister, or a meer Lay-*Christian*. And therefore a hundred Passages cited either from the Antient or Modern Writers, to nullify and invalidate all the Ministerial Performances of unconsecrated and unlawful Ministers, are insignificant to the Point in Hand, unless they say expressly

presly that *Baptism* administered by such is *invalid*; which I dare say they will never be able to produce, provided they mean *Baptism* administered in the *Matter* and *Form* prescribed by Christ.

Upon the whole Matter therefore, I cannot see, that the Observations the Doctor has made are right, nor the Conclusions he has drawn from them to be just and good; nor Consequently can I find he has any manner of Reason to think, that the *Office of the Ministratiōn of Baptism* to such as be of riper Years, was made and intended for such as had been *invalidly baptizēd*, by *unlawful Ministers*. And therefore I am still of the Opinion, that the *Church of England* hath by no *Act of hers*, made or declared *Lay-Baptism* to be *invalid*.

I.
ook
And I will add but one Argument more, in Proof of this Position, and that shall be also fetched from the Silence of the *Preachers* and the *Writers* of the *Church of England* in this Point, from the Year 1660 till the Year 1700.

Did any of my Lords the *Bishops* in their *primary Visitations*, after the *Restoration* of King *Charles II* (the propereſt Season certainly) give it in Charge to their *Clergy*, to inform their People, either by *Preaching*, or *Writing*, that such as had been *Baptized* by *unlawful Nonconforming, unepiscopal, Ministers*, were not *Christians*, having not been *validly Baptized*, and therefore that all such must be *baptized anew*? Does any one remember such Instructions given about that Time, or since? Did the *Writers* of

Con-

Controversy who were many, and for many Years, among other Points debated, did they, say, insist on the *Invalidity* of the Dissenters Baptism, in any of their Books? Did the London—or the Country Ministers, who were the most zealous to bring their People to Conformity, and a good liking of the Church-way, and to rescue them from Schism and Separation, and the Mischiefs of it, did they begin with this, that they must consider they were not *Christians*, and wanted *true Baptism*? Does any one call to mind, that any such Arguments as these were used to perswade their Flocks to enter into Christ's Fold, by the Gate of Baptism? Did they pretend to convert the Dissenters to Christianity? Or to leave the Separation, and come over the Church? Is it not a very modern Thing, is not of Yesterday, to hear it said, that the Dissenters are not *Christians*, having been baptized with Water, in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? And yet, will any reasonable Man tell us, that it was not the Duty of the Bishops to have given these things in Charge the Clergy? Will any one say, it was not the proper business of the controversial Writers, to have insisted mainly on this great Point? Or could the Parish-Priests have done any thing better, more pleasing to God, or more useful to the people, than to have told them, they must become *Christians* and be *Baptized*? Was there an utter Neglect of this great Duty among all sorts of Parties concerned, at a Time when nothing could have been more proper? Who can easily come into this Belief? If this Silence of the

Ecclesiastical Governours, of the Parish-Priests and of the Writers of Controversy, be not Proof of the Church of *England's* Judgment in the Matter; I must despair of knowing what can be one.

And thus I have gone through the little Work I undertook: Which was not to prove the Validity of Lay-Baptism; nor to prove the Baptism of Dissenters to be good and valid, in Opposition to the Author of *Lay-Baptism's Invalidity*, or in Opposition to Dr. *Hicks* his Abetter and Encourager; this was not my Design; but to make good my Position—*That the Church of England bath, by no publick Act of hers, made or declared Lay-Baptism to be invalid.* Both those Writers had affirm'd that the Church of *England* accounted Lay-Baptism, and the Baptism of Dissenting Ministers, to be *invalid*; as far as they affirm'd that, I have concerned my self with them, and no farther. But because I could not disprove their Allegations in this particular, without discovering my Opinion in the general, of the Matter in dispute, every Body will see I am of very different Judgment from those Writers. The only thing I would leave with the Reader is to consider, whether I have not made good my Position, from the particular Proofs I have brought; from the Consideration of the Offices of Baptism and their Rubrics; from the Confirmations of the Bishops after 1660; and from the Silence of the Clergy, and Church-Writers, upwards of Forty Years, in a Matter where every Body will see they were highly concerned to have spoken. And if the Church of *England*

has not declared *Lay-Baptism*, and *Dissenters Baptism*, to be *invalid*, I cannot choose but think it a very great Presumption for any private Member of her Communion, to do so. As for what the Author of the aforesaid Book, says of the 23d and 26th *Articles*; he may know that those Articles were made in 1552 (as well as 1562) by many of the same People who made the Office of Baptism and Rubrics in 1548 and 1552: And that therefore the Allowance of Lay-Baptism, was not thought to clash, or be inconsistent with those Articles. But he may also know, that the Church by requiring a *lawful Minister* to Baptism, does not, by necessary consequence, invalidate a Baptism conferred by an *unlawful Minister*. The Reader will, I hope, be content, that, in Affirmance of my position, I present him with some Citations, out of Mr. Hooker, and Mr. Thorndike; the one before, the other since the Change made in 1603.

D 2 Appendix.



Appendix.

TH E famous *Tho. Cartwright*, Lib. i. Pag. 143. Saith ‘ that private Baptism first rose upon a false Interpretation of St. John, 3. Unless a Man be born again of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Where certain do interpret the word Water for the material and elemental Water; whereas our Saviour Christ taketh Water there, by a borrowed Speech for the Spirit of God, the Effect whereof it shaddoweth out.

To this, Mr. *Richard Hooker*, Lib. v. §. 59. applies—

‘ To hide the general consent of Antiquity, agreeing in the literal Interpretation, they cunningly affirm, that *certain* have taken these Words, as meant of material Water, when they know that of *all the Antients* there is *not one* to be named, that ever did otherwise either expound or alledge that Place than as implying external Baptism.

‘ *Tho. Cartwright*, Lib. i. 146. The Orders which God hath set are, that it should be done in the Congregation, and by the Minister. And I will further say, that altho’ the

fants which dye without Baptism, should be assuredly *damned* (which is most false) yet ought not the Orders, which God hath set in his Church, be broken after this sort.

To this Mr. *Hooker* replies at large, Lib. v. §. 61. but I will only set down a few Lines.

' To acknowledge Christ's Institution to be the ground of both Sacraments, I suppose no Christian Man will refuse: For it giveth them their very Nature, it appointeth *the Matter* whereof they consist; the *Form* of their Administration it teacheth; and it blesseth them with that *Grace*, whereby they are to us, both Pledges and Instruments of Life. Nevertheless, seeing Christ's Institution containeth, besides that which maketh compleat the Essence or Nature, other things that are only Parts, as it were, of the Furniture of Sacra- ments; the difference between these two must unfold that which the general Terms of indefinite Speech would confound. [I assure the Reader, that Mr. *Hooker* was of Bishop *Bilson's* Mind, that the Minister was not of the Essence of Baptism.]

T. C. Lib. i. Page 144.

' On this Point, whether he be a Minister or no, dependeth not only the *Dignity*, but the *Being* of the Sacrament. So that I take the Baptism of *Women*, to be no more the Holy Sacrament of Baptism, than any other daily or ordinary *washing* of the Child.

Mr. *Hooker*, Lib. v. §. 62. which I desire the Reader to look carefully over, if he has the Book by him. I only transcribe some Parts of

it, for the sake of those who have it not. And little could any body have thought, that the Arguments which *Thomas Cartwright*, a principal *Puritan Minister* produced above an hundred Years ago, against the *Doctrine, Practice, Service, and Ministers* of the Church of *England*, in the Point of *Lay-Baptism*; should now be again produced by Doctor *H-s*, and several *Church of England Ministers*, against the *Dissenting Ministers*, to prove their Baptism to be *Lay-Baptism*, and altogether *invalid, null and void*; *sprinkling*, and *washing*, if you will but not *baptizing* any one. And that, at the same time, the Arguments of Mr. *Hooker* should be produced to prove their Baptisms *valid*. But we have lived to see strange Things: And these Humours may go on, and be received encouraged, and applauded by the young Students and Divines, we may see stranger yet. But God forbid! Let this Digression be forgotten, and I go on.

Lib. v. §. 62. Page 231.

' The Reason whereupon they ground the
 ' Opinion, viz. That Baptism by Women
 ' no more a Sacrament, than any other or
 ' ordinary washing or bathing a Man's Body,
 ' such, as making Baptism by Women void
 ' because Women are no Ministers in the
 ' Church of God, must needs generally An-
 ' nihilate the Baptism of all unto whom the
 ' Conceit shall apply this Exception, whether
 ' it be in regard Of *Sex*, of *Quality*, of *In-
 ' sufficiency* or whatsoever. For if want of *call-
 ' ing* do frustrate Baptism, they that baptize with
 ' ou

out calling, do nothing, be they Women or Men.

Page 232. ‘ To Womens Baptism in Private, by Occasion of urgent Necessity, the Reasons that only concern ordinary Baptisms in Publick, are no just prejudice : Neither can we by force thereof disprove the Practice of those Churches, which (necessity requiring) allow Baptism in private, to be administred by Women. We may not from Laws that prohibit any thing with Restraint, conclude absolute and unlimited Prohibitions : Altho’ we deny not but they which utterly forbid such Baptism, may have, perhaps, wherewith to justify their Orders against it. For, even things lawful are well prohibited, when there is fear least they make the way to unlawful more easy. And, it may be, the liberty of Baptism at such Times by Women, doth sometimes embolden the rasher sort to do it, where no such necessity is. But whether of Permission, *besides Law*, or in presumption *against Law*, they do it, is it thereby altogether *frustrate, void*, and as tho’ it were never given ? They which have not at the first, their right Baptism, must of necessity be *rebaptized*, because the Law of Christ tyeth all Men to receive Baptism. Iteration of Baptism once given, hath been always thought a manifest Contempt of that antient apostolick Aphorism, *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism* : Baptism not only One in as much as it hath every where the *same Substance*, and offereth unto all Men *the same Grace*; but One also, for that it ought not to be received by any one

‘ Man above once. [This Argument he pursues
 in a convincing Manner ; and goes on to give
 the History of Rebaptizing maintained by St.
 Cyprian and the *African Church*, whom he af-
 firms to have been mistaken : And makes this
 wise Remark upon him — That the Teacher’s
 Error is the People’s Trial, harder and heavier by so
 much to bear, as He is in Worth and Regard greater
 than persuadeth them — And after a great deal said
 on this Head, worthy, every Line of it, to be
 thoughtfully perused by our new-fangled Min-
 isters, he says] ‘ Since the Church of God hath
 ‘ always hitherto constantly maintained, that
 ‘ to rebaptize them which are known to have
 ‘ received true Baptism, is unlawful : That if
 ‘ Baptism be seriously administered, in the same
 ‘ Element, and with the same Form of Words,
 ‘ which Christ’s Institution teacheth, there is
 ‘ no other Defect in the World that can make it
 ‘ frustrate, or deprive it of the Nature of a true
 ‘ Sacrament : And lastly, That Baptism is only
 ‘ then to be readministered, when the first Deli-
 ‘ verythereof is void, in regard of the forealledg-
 ‘ ed Imperfections, and no other : Shall we now
 ‘ in the Case of Baptism, which having both
 ‘ for Matter and Form, the Substance of Christ’s
 ‘ Institution, is by a sort of Men voided for the
 ‘ only Defect of Ecclesiastical Authority in the
 ‘ Minister ; shall we, I say, think it enough,
 ‘ that the Puritans blow away the Force thereof,
 ‘ with the bare Strength of their very Breath,
 ‘ by saying — We take such Baptisms to be
 ‘ no more the Sacrament of Baptism, than any
 ‘ other ordinary Bathing to be a Sacrament ? It be-
 ‘ hoveth

hoveth generally all Sorts of Men, to keep
 themselves within the Limits of their own Vo-
 cation. And seeing God, from whom Mens se-
 veral Degrees and Praeminencies do proceed,
 hath appointed them in his Church, at whose
 Hands His Pleasure is, that we should receive
 both Baptism, and all other publick medicinal
 Helps of Soul, perhaps thereby the more to set-
 tle our Hearts, in the Love of our Ghostly Su-
 periours ; they have small Cause to hope, that
 with Him their voluntary Services will be
 accepted, who thrust themselves into Functi-
 ons, either above their Capacity, or besides
 their Place, and overboldly intermeddle with
 Duties, whereof no Charge was ever given
 them : They that in any thing exceed the
 Compass of their own Order, do, as much as
 in them lieth, to dissolve that Order which is
 the Harmony of God's Church. Suppose
 therefore, that in these and the like Conside-
 rations, the Law did utterly prohibit Bap-
 tism to be administered by any other, than
 Persons thereunto solemnly consecrated, what
 Necessity soever happen ; are not many things
 firm being done, altho, in Part, done other-
 wise than positive Rigor and Strictness did
 require ? Nature, as much as is possible, in-
 clineth unto *Validities*, and Preservations : Dis-
 solutions, and *Nullities* of things done, are not
 only not favoured, but hated, when either urged
 without Cause, or extended beyond their Reach.
 If therefore at any Time it come to pass, that
 in teaching publickly or privately, in deliver-
 ing this blessed Sacrament of Regeneration,

some

some unsanctified Hand, contrary to Christ's supposed Ordinance, do intrude it self to execute that, whereunto the Laws of God, and his Church have deputed others ; which of these two Opinions seemeth more agreeable with Equity, Ours [of the Church of England] that disallow what is done amiss, yet make not the Force of the Word and Sacraments, much less their Nature and very Substance, to depend on the Minister's Authority and Calling, or else Theirs [the Puritans heretofore, but now Dr. H—s, and many young Clergymen's] which defeat, disannull, and annihilate both, in Respect of that one only personal Defect ; there being not any Law of God, which saith that if the Minister be incompetent, his Word shall be no Word, his Baptism no Baptism ?

And p. 239 ' The Grace of Baptism cometh, by Donation, from God alone : That God hath committed the Ministry of Baptism unto special Men, it is for Order's sake in his Church, and not to the end that their Authority might give Being, or add Force to the Sacrament it self. That Infants have right to the Sacrament in Baptism we all acknowledge. Charge them we cannot as guileful and wrongful Possessors of that, whereunto they have Right by the manifest Will of the Donor, and are not Parties unto any Defect or Disorder in the manner of receiving the same. And if any such Disorder be, we have sufficiently before declared, that *Delictum cum Capite semper ambusat*, Mens own Faults are their own Harms.

And

And last of all. ‘ Whereas general and full Consent of the godly-learned of all Ages, doth make for Validity of Baptism; yea, albeit administered in private, and even by Women; which kind of Baptism in Case of Necessity, divers Reformed Churches do both allow and defend; some others, which do not defend, tolerate: Few, in Comparison, and they without any just Cause, do utterly disanull and annihilate: Surely however, through Defect on either side, the Sacrament may be without Fruit, as well in some Cases to him which receiveth, as to him which giveth it; yet no Disability of either part can so far make it frustrate and without effect, as to deprive it of the very Nature of true Baptism, having all things else, which the Ordinance of Christ requireth.

Mr. Thorndike in his *Rights of the Church in a Christian State.* In the Year 1649. p. 107. hath these Words.

‘ If the Charge of Baptizing given the Apostles, had been meant of the Office of Ministering, not of the Power of granting it, what Reason could there be, that St. Peter, having converted Cornelius and his Company, should not baptize them in Person, but command them to be baptized? *Acts 10. 48.*

‘ And if the Apostles employ their Deacon St. Philip, to preach and to baptize, is it not by Consequence, that the Governours of particular Churches employ their Deacons about the same? In the Synagogue it cannot be said that the Office of Circumcising ever required any higher Quality than that of a Person circumcised: And

And therefore in the Church, if there can be any Question, whether a Person is to be admitted to Baptism or no, it is the chief Power of the Church that must determine it. Or if the Occasion require Solemnity, which may argue him that officiates it, to be the Chief in the Church, no *Deacon* nor *Presbyter* must presume to do it before the Bishop. But because Baptism is the Gate, as well of the invisible Church, as of the visible: And because the Occasions are many and divers which endanger the preventing of so necessary an Office by Death; in this Regard, the Practice of the Primitive Church, alledged by *Tertullian De Bapt.* c. 18. must not be condemned, whereby Baptism given by him that is *only baptiz'd*, is not only *valid* but *well done*.

Mr. Thorndike in his *Epilogue*. 1659. p. 150.
lib. 3.

When the Power of Confirming, proper to the Bishop, evidenceth, that he alone granteth Baptism (either by particular Appointment, or by general Law, in which his Authority is involved) but a *Lay-man* sometimes may minister it; we see what St. Paul means when he says, *1 Cor. 1. 17.* God sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel: Our Lord having said, *Matth. 28. 19.* Go preach and make Disciples of all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: To wit, that the Power of appointing it, not the Ministry of doing it, is proper to the Apostles and their Successors. Which Reason will hold in sundry Particulars, concerning Ordination,

con-

concerning *Absolution* and *Penance*, concerning *Confirmation* and others. In all which this being once secured, that no Man act beyond the Power, which he receiveth, it will be no Prejudice to the Unity of the Church, than some Orders do that, by particular Commission from their Superiors, which their Order enables not all that are of it, to do. Because in such Cases, it is not *Authority*, but *Ministry* which they contribute.

Idem. lib. 3. p. 67.

But a great many Witnesses speak not so much, as the *Law*, the *Rule*, the *Custom*, of giving Baptism by *any Man that was a Christian* in that Case of Necessity. (*i. e.* rather than any one should dye unbaptized) For, out of that Case of Necessity, the Office of Baptizing belong'd to the very highest in the Church; to wit, so as might stand with the more weighty Implications of their Office: For otherwife, a little common Sense would serve to inform them, that those Offices which required more of their Personal Knowledge, Skill, Wisdom, and Goodness, were to be preferred before the Office of Baptizing; which, tho' it concerns Salvation, yet requires no such Qualities. Can any Man then imagine any Reason, why all Christians are *licensed*, or rather *commanded* to baptize in that Case, but the *Necessity of the Office*? And that no Infant should go out of the World unbaptized? And this chokes all the Exception that is made from the Custom of giving Infants the *Eucharist*, in the antient Church. For, as I have shew-

' shewed before that it was not held necessary
 ' to Salvation, as Baptism was; so here I must
 ' alledge, that it cannot be said, that the Eu-
 ' charist was celebrated, and that all Christians
 ' might celebrate the Eucharist, in this Case of
 ' Necessity, to the Intent that Infants might
 ' not go out of the World, either unbaptized,
 ' or without the Eucharist.

Mr. Thorndike. *Just Weights and Measures.*
 1662. p. 114.

' As for the Sacrament of Baptism; that, as
 ' the Bishop only allows it, in any Case that
 ' may be questionable; so the Ministering of it
 ' may come to a Deacon, in the Priest's Absence,
 ' nay to a Lay-Man, rather than that any Child
 ' should dye unbaptized.

9 NOV

F I N I S.

P. 44. L. 9. for *perswadeth*, read *misperswadeth*.